

Remarks

The Official Action allowed claims 13-16 and 25, objected to claims 6 and 11, and rejected claims 1-12 and 17-24. Applicant has amended claims 1, 7, 13, 17, 21 and 25. Claims 1-25 are now pending in the present application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in the light of the points that follow.

Allowed and Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant gratefully acknowledges that the Examiner's allowance of claims 13-16 and 25. Further, Applicant gratefully acknowledges that claims 6 and 11 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant, however, has elected not to rewrite such claims 6 and 11 at this time since Applicant believes the claims from which they depend are also allowable.

Claim Rejection – Under 35 USC § 112

The Official Action rejected claims 5 and 10 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully points out that claims 5 and 10 defines a "different type of resource sharing paradigm than said physical connection", which provides a standard for ascertaining whether the resource sharing paradigm of the processor bus is different than the resource

sharing paradigm of the physical connection. Applicant respectfully requests the present rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – Under 35 USC § 102

The Official Action rejected claims 1-4, 7-9, 12, 17 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Walsh et al. (5329521). Applicant has amended claims 1, 7, 17 and 21. Applicant respectfully requests the present rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 17

Claims 1 and 17 as amended require a physical connection joining said first node and said second node **through which signals of both said first channel and said second channel are carried**, and a first controller connected to said first end of said first channel and a second controller connected to a first end of said second channel, said first controller and said second controller being in communication and **controlling interleaving of data from said two channels through said physical connection**. Applicant respectfully points out that Walsh et al. seem to merely disclose two nodes communicating over **two or more** links via redundant adapters (col. 2, lines 55-62). In particular, Walsh et al. explicitly disclose that node 14 transmits messages onto both links 10 and 12 and receives selected messages from links 10 and 12 with low error rate (col. 3, lines 15-28, 43-49 and 60-65). Accordingly, Walsh et al. only appear to teach conveying messages from a node over two links. On the contrary, the inventions of Applicant's claims 1 and 17 employ a physical

connection carrying signals from two channels. Accordingly, it seems that Walsh et al. do not need or teach controlling interleaving, because Walsh et al. teaches conveying messages from a node over separate links. Therefore, Walsh et al. do not need or suggest joining said first node and said second node through which signals of both said first channel and said second channel are carried, and a first controller and a second controller controlling interleaving of data from said two channels in said physical connection, not anticipating the inventions of Applicant's claims 1 and 17.

Applicant respectfully requests that the present rejection of claims 1 and 17 be withdrawn.

Claims 7 and 21

Claims 7 and 21 as amended require **connecting one end of said physical connection to one end of at least two channels and connecting the opposite end of said physical connection to the other end of said at least two channels; and interleaving flits from said two channels along the physical connection.** As mentioned above, Walsh et al. seem to disclose that node 14 transmits messages onto both links 10 and 12 and receives selected messages from links 10 and 12 with low error rate (col. 3, lines 15-28, 43-49 and 60-65). Thus, Walsh et al. appear to only teach conveying messages from a node over separate links, but not a physical connection connecting to at least two channels. Accordingly, it appears that Walsh et al. do not need or teach interleaving, because Walsh et al. teaches conveying

messages from a node over separate links. Therefore, Walsh et al. do suggest connecting one end of said physical connection to one end of each of at least two channels and connecting the opposite end of said physical connection to the other end of each of said at least two channels, and interleaving flits from said two channels along the physical connection, not anticipating the inventions of Applicant's claims 7 and 21.

Applicant respectfully requests that the present rejection of claim 7 and 21 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-4, 8, 9 and 12

Claims 2-4, 8, 9 and 12 depend respectively on claims 1 and 7. Therefore, claims 2-4, 8, 9 and 12 are at least allowable for the reasons noted above in regard to claims 1 and 7. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 2-4, 8, 9 and 12 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – Under 35 USC § 103

The Office Action rejected claims 18-20 and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walsh et al. in view of Parthasarathy et al. (US 6831916 B1).

Applicant respectfully points out that, to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490, F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974, M.P.E.P. § 2143.03).

Each of claims 18-20 and 22-24 depends respectively on claims 17 and 21.

As mentioned above, Walsh et al. seem to merely disclose two nodes communicating over **two or more** links via redundant adapters (col. 2, lines 55-62).

In particular, Walsh et al. explicitly disclose that node 14 transmits messages onto both links 10 and 12 and receives selected messages from links 10 and 12 with low error rate (col. 3, lines 15-28, 43-49 and 60-65). Accordingly, Walsh et al. only appear to teach conveying messages from a node over two links. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Walsh et al. are devoid of any teaching or suggestion of the limitations noted above in regard to claims 17 and 21. Further, Parthasarathy et al. are also devoid of any teaching or suggestion of the limitations noted above in regard to claims 17 and 21. Since Walsh et al. and Parthasarathy et al., taken separately or in combination, are devoid of any teaching or suggestion of the limitations noted above in regard to claims 17 and 21, the combination of Walsh et al. and Parthasarathy et al. does not teach all the claim limitations in Applicant's claims 18-20 and 22-24. Thus, the *prima facie* obviousness of the inventions of claims 18-20 and 22-24 can not be established.

Applicant respectfully requests that the present rejections of claims 18-20 and 22-24 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the Official Action. Applicant submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is requested, and allowance of the pending claims is earnestly solicited.

Should it be determined that an additional fee is due under 37 CFR §§1.16 or 1.17, or any excess fee has been received, please charge that fee or credit the amount of overcharge to deposit account number 02-2666. If the Examiner believes that there are any informalities which can be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, a telephone call to the undersigned at (503) 439-8778 is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul A. Mendonsa
Reg. No. 42,879

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030
(408) 720-8300

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450	
On: <u>June 10, 2005</u>	<u>6/10/05</u>
Signature <u>Rachael Brown</u>	Date